1985

Review of *La scultura in pietra di Selinunte*, by Vincenzo Tusa, with contributions by G. Pugliese Carratelli, E. Paribeni, M. Carapezza et al.

Brunilde S. Ridgway
Bryn Mawr College, bridgway@brynmawr.edu

without counting group K, which is not a stylistic subdivision proper.

Yet even this meticulous apportioning of protomes could be acceptable, were the total picture of help in clarifying our understanding of regional styles and centers; but such is certainly not the case. Croissant is scrupulous in reiterating that his distributions are subject to revision according to new finds or evidence, that information on regional centers is scant or uncertain, that differences between types may be minimal and stylistic assessments subjective. I must admit I cannot always tell one group from another—let alone the various types within the group or the variations within the types—nor am I helped by the well laid-out plates with meaningful juxtapositions of comparable items. Perhaps only someone with Croissant's long familiarity based on constant handling of the protomes can distinguish them readily. The comparanda in monumental sculpture or other forms of art seem often equally elusive: either I cannot see the resemblances or I cannot subscribe to the regional attributions. To give but one example, the so-called Sleeping Head in the British Museum usually thought to belong to one of the Ephesian *columnae caelatae* is by Croissant labelled Milesian and used as a cog within his regional construction (p. 62); yet the recent study of all Ephesian material by C.A. Picón has convincingly shown that the London head belongs to the Artemision and is stylistically related to the other temple sculptures.

To be sure, Croissant describes vividly and at length, trying to make the reader see what he perceives as regional traits and distinctive features, but his very fluid language may hamper rather than increase comprehension. It is not that one does not understand, even share, Croissant's intuitive reading of facial expressions; it is just that it is hard to accept as objective comparisons based on, e.g., "la même franchise attentive, la même gaieté dynamique" (p. 146). The task is not made easier by the endless paragraphs, one of which can fill an entire page, and by the free associating of the thought-process, so wide ranging that virtually every major monument of the archaic and severe period is brought into the discussion—repeatedly, in different contexts and for different purposes, as the index and table of contents show.

Even the origin of Attic Red Figure is investigated in this scholarly cavalcade that is too rich in original thoughts and suggestions to assimilate at a single reading. I have only retained a few points, perhaps because closest to my concerns: that the Siphnian Karyatid and the so-called ex-Knidian head may, after all, belong to the same Treasury (p. 72 n. 1); that the Knidian Treasury may have had no karyatids at all (78 n. 4); that the heads from the Aigina temple are so varied as to represent deliberate eclecticism (369); and that the Piombino Apollo, although probably archaizing (216), can nonetheless be used to date comparable protomes around 480 (111). Croissant is so open to the various possibilities for interpretation and so conscious of the variables in each problem that the reader eventually cannot even find firm points for debate, whether in agreement or disagreement.

If the proof of the pudding is in the eating, the proof of a book should be in the reading. On such criteria, I can only state that this book has not passed the test: I have emerged from it with much vaguer notions than when I started it, and this result is all the more regrettable in that so much effort and connoisseurship have clearly been expended on it. But in its present form I can only concur with Croissant that "loin de fournir des indications sur la chronologie, le style apparaît donc comme un facteur qui par définition en occulte les effets" (375) and that "la conclusion d'une telle enquête ne saurait être évidemment que provisoire" (373).

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY
DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL AND
NEAR EASTERN ARCHAEOLOGY
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE
BRYN MAWR, PENNSYLVANIA 19010

LA SCULTURA IN PIETRA DI SELINUNTE, by *Vincenzo Tusa*, with contributions by *G. Pugliese Carratelli, E. Paribeni, M. Carapezza et al.* Pp. 200, color pls. 16, black-and-white pls. 46, text figs. 16 + 303. Sellerio Ed., Palermo, 1983–1984.

Vincenzo Tusa, Archaeological Superintendent of western Sicily, has fulfilled one of the strongest *desiderata* in the field of Magna Graecian art history by providing this comprehensive, well illustrated and thoroughly documented publication of 301 items of stone sculpture from Selinous. These include all the well known metopal series and reliefs, but also as many as 242 unpublished pieces, some of them architectural, some freestanding and some of undefinable nature, both in marble and in local stone. Even items of presumed Selinuntine origin not in the Palermo Museum receive passing mention. The import of such extensive collection and publication is bound to be felt for many years to come.

In his prefatory comments Tusa stresses Selinous' originality in being "the only Greek city in Sicily to decorate its temples with stone sculptures" (15). The statement may seem rather sweeping in light of the pedimental remains once again recently attributed to Akragan and Himeran religious buildings (see, e.g., *Aparchai* [Festschrift P. Arias, 1982] passim), but it holds true for the archaic period, and especially for metopal decoration. (Note, however, that Tusa [125, **no. 18** n. 6] would disclaim for Selinous the so-called Harpy metope in Copenhagen, which is generally considered to be from Sicily and would therefore imply metopal stone-carving elsewhere on the island.) Selinuntine workmanship is advocated for all pieces, including the marble parts from Temple E, although the analysis is sensitive to outside influences—from the mainland Greeks, the peoples of Asia Minor, the Phoenicians and local populations, as one would expect from a Phoenician expert of Tusa's caliber.

G. Pugliese Carratelli sketches the historical and religious background of Selinous, without however entering the thorny grounds of colonization dates. Helpful comments on Megara, both Hyblaia and Nysaia, underline the importance of a Malophoros cult in the Greek metropoleis, thus challenging the assumption that Selinous simply adopted Sicilian religious beliefs. Mycenaean and Cretan contacts are mentioned, as well as the difficult interrelationships of

the Greek cities in Sicily down to approximately 409 B.C., the date of the Carthaginian destruction from which Selinous never quite recovered.

E. Paribeni contributes a "historico-critical profile" of Selinuntine sculptures which takes into account also terracottas and the bronze Ephebe, whose disharmonious appearance has now been clarified by the discovery of ancient repairs and alterations. Even some forgeries are mentioned at the end of this brief but informative essay in which opinions disagreeing with those of the primary author are occasionally expressed. Paribeni, in fact, does not believe that the folds on the Perseus of the Temple C metope were recut and modernized (p. 28), whereas Tusa (116) finds the theory convincing.

M. Carapezza and collaborators provide a geological commentary on the sculptures and the geographical area. They have identified three ancient quarries and plot a pattern of ever-extending radius away from the city as each source is exploited (cf. map fig. 5, p. 33). The farthest, the so-called Menfi quarries, provided the stone for carved metopes and sculptures, the better vein being tapped for the metopes in preference to the freestanding pieces.

The above-mentioned essays form a prelude to the magnificent color plates of the ruins, followed by large black-and-white illustrations of the major sculptures. There are no novelties among the metopes, but the marble and limestone peplophoroi are less familiar and receive well deserved attention. Then comes the most important section of the book: the extensive and systematic catalogue entries, each accompanied by an illustration at small scale, and ending with **nos. 300–301**, whose authenticity has been doubted. Of the two, the stele of a youth is further discussed in an appendix subdivided into various topics—e.g., on the so-called *piccole metope* (the Y series and the two "new" panels which Tusa no longer considers part of a single building, despite the similar dimensions); and on the two frieze blocks with fighting warriors (Amazonomachy?) dated between 490 and 470, although others would put them some 50 years later. Of special importance is the discussion on the findspots of the Temple C fragments (p. 187), all from the east front, thus precluding the possibility that the west side also carried decorated metopes. The total format of the book is elegant and readable, with few obvious mistakes, although a few of the catalogue illustrations seem upside down or otherwise rotated.

It is impossible to comment in detail on the catalogue entries, which provide little known information and correct many inaccuracies in previous publications. The following remarks reflect "reviewer's *arbitrium*." The numbers correspond to the individual entries.

Nos. 3–6, the "Y" metopes: a date in the early 6th, even late 7th c. for the panel with the Delphic triad, seems quite high. No attempt is made at suggesting a program for the series; yet Apollo in traveling attire (winged boots, short tunic) may be returning from the Hyperboreans (cf. *LIMC* 2, s.v. Apollon no. 643), Europa and the swimming Bull go from one continent to another, while Herakles struggling with the Cretan Bull may again be indicative of travel westward, or at least to remote places.

No. 11, metope from Temple F: I read the dress of the goddess as the standard chiton with diagonal himation, not as a short garment leaving the right thigh bare (p. 119). This impression is caused by the cloth clinging to the trailing leg and suggesting transparency, but the long folds following the curve of the knee belong to the gathering of the skirt between the legs.

No. 18, so-called Hades abducting Persephone: Tusa prefers Peirithoos attempting to kidnap Persephone. Note that the woman wears the diagonal mantle from left shoulder to right armpit, an unusual form in isolation (i.e., not dictated by mirror reversal), but attested in South Italy and Asia Minor. If the draped figure in **no. 21** is indeed female, it would provide another example of this fashion.

Nos. 31–38, an interesting group of small-scale peplophoroi (also discussed in Appendix), most in limestone, two in marble: they are probably the most convincing evidence for a local school, because of the peculiar folds engraved on the upper torso and the distinctive crinkling of the chiton sleeves under the peplos. R. Tölle-Kastenbein cited **no. 34** only in a footnote (*Frühklassische Peplosfiguren. Originale* [Mainz 1980] 193 n. 361), because she considered it "Severizing" rather than truly Severe (although she accepted the marble statuettes **nos. 31–32**, her nos. 35a–35b). But seeing these peplophoroi as a group highlights their similarities and connects them with the Artemis of the Aktaion metope from Temple E, so that a true Severe dating seems inevitable.

Among the unpublished pieces the most interesting are: **no. 29**, the corner of a metope preserving an elaborately coiffured female head, from the eastern hill; **no. 60**, a small male torso with harsh anatomical markings, "late classical/early Hellenistic"; **no. 64**, a squatting, plump child in Greek marble (and cf. **no. 97**, a chubby baby's foot); **no. 65**, a fragmentary relief of the Funerary Banquet type; **no. 268**, another relief fragment, probably with tenon for insertion into a separate support, showing some linear drapery over rocky ground; **no. 298**, a marble snake coil; **no. 299**, a large horse's tail, probably archaic, in Greek island(?) marble, worked all around and with bronze tenon for attachment.

The many draped fragments, the numerous hands and feet and several heads probably come from the lost metopes of the well known series and may now for the first time be studied and perhaps integrated into more meaningful wholes. Whatever the results achieved, we shall owe them to Tusa's initiative. His modest disclaimer (p. 14) that he has meant to provide only a working tool, not a critical edition of Selinuntine sculpture, is amply belied by the wealth of material and information presented in this book. The author is to be commended indeed and sincerely thanked.

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY
DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL AND
NEAR EASTERN ARCHAEOLOGY
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE
BRYN MAWR, PENNSYLVANIA 19010

CAMPANIA, by *Martin Fredericksen*, edited with additions by *Nicholas Purcell*. Pp. xviii + 368, maps 5, plates 15. British School at Rome, 1984.

This volume represents the vigorous thinking and writing which Martin Fredericksen devoted to the study of Campania before his untimely death in 1980. Much of it was written between 1967 and 1974, and it is evident from the surviving typescript that Fredericksen had in mind a larger book both in terms of conceptual range and of specific problems. That any of this absorbing material has seen the printed page in book form is due to the energies and skills of Nicholas Purcell and his colleagues.

There are 14 chapters in all, of which Purcell found 11